

It is noted that because claim 10 was not rejected by the Examiner, claim 10 is deemed patentable.

The above-identified application claims a surface-mounted electronic component module that includes a wiring substrate having wiring patterns and external connection terminals, a plurality of electronic component devices, a bonding wire connecting the connection terminal of one of the plurality of electronic component devices with another one of the plurality of electronic component devices, the bonding wire having an inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the one electronic component device, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 5.

The Office Action admits that Huang fails to teach that the bonding wire has an inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic (Office Action, page 3, lines 4-6). The Office Action also admits that Yamada fails to teach that the bonding wire has an inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic (Office Action, page 5, lines 8-12). The Office Action relies on Kemmochi to disclose or suggest this feature. However, the Office Action is mistaken for the following reasons.

Kemmochi teaches a high-frequency switch module which comprises a high-frequency switch circuit connected among an antenna, a transmission circuit and a reception circuit and comprising switching elements and a surface acoustic wave filter connected between the high-frequency switch circuit and the reception circuit (Abstract). Kemmochi further teaches that by arranging an inductor in the vicinity of the balanced output terminal of the SAW filter in parallel thereto, the ripple due to parasitic impedance

can preferably be suppressed (paragraph [0095]). Accordingly, Kemmochi clearly teaches that the inductor is a stand-alone inductor that is arranged next to the SAW filter, and that the inductor is arranged in parallel to the SAW filter. However, the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 5 clearly recites that it is the bonding wire itself that has an inductance that eliminates the ripples. Thus, combining the teachings of Kemmochi with the teachings of either Huang or Yamada would result in adding an additional inductor into the devices taught in Huang and Yamada, respectively. However, even by adding an additional inductor into the devices taught in Huang and Yamada, the teachings of Kemmochi do not provide that the bonding wire that bonds the connection terminal to one of the plurality of electronic component devices, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5 and illustrated in the drawings as, for example, Figure 11, has an inductance that is capable of eliminating the ripples. Moreover, adding an inductor as taught in Kemmochi in the devices taught in Huang and Yamada would result in unduly increasing the size and cost of the devices taught in Huang and Yamada. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Kemmochi with the teachings of either Huang or Yamada in order to arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 5. Further, because the bonding wire is the wire that connects the connection terminal to one of the plurality of electronic component devices, and because the electronic component devices are also connected to the surface acoustic wave filter, as illustrated in, for example, Figure 11, then the bonding wire is not connected in parallel to the surface acoustic wave filter, which is the teaching of Kemmochi. For this additional reason, the combination of Kemmochi with Huang or Yamada does not arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 5.

Fujimoto teaches a method of manufacturing electronic parts that includes preparing a mother board, mounting element parts on the mother board and providing a thermosetting resin on a surface of the mother board surface on which the element parts are mounted (Abstract), and fails to cure deficiencies in Huang, Yamada and Kemmochi in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claims 3 and 7, including the features of independent claims 1 and 5.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 5, and their dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of all the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 108066-00087.**

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/elz